

REMARK ON THE FAILURE OF MARTIN'S AXIOM

AVNER LANDVER

Let m be the least cardinal θ such that MA_θ fails. The only known model for “ m is singular” was constructed by Kunen [K1]. In Kunen’s model $\text{cof}(m) = \omega_1$. It is unknown whether “ $\omega_1 < \text{cof}(m) < m$ ” is consistent. The purpose of this paper is to present a proof of Kunen’s result and to identify the difficulties of generalizing this result to an arbitrary uncountable cofinality. The following material is based on [K1]. We would like to thank K. Kunen and S. Shelah [S] for their input.

§0 Definitions and some facts.

For undefined terminology consult [K]. Let θ be a fixed singular cardinal with uncountable cofinality. Let $\kappa = \text{cof}(\theta)$, and fix $\{\theta_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ an increasing sequence of cardinals converging to θ with $\theta_0 > \kappa$.

Let $\mathcal{A} = \{a_\xi : \xi \in \theta\} \subseteq \wp(\omega)$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{b_\xi : \xi \in \theta\} \subseteq \wp(\omega)$. $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is a (θ, θ) **pair** if for every $\xi, \eta \in \theta$, $|a_\xi \cap b_\eta| < \aleph_0$. The pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is **disjoint** if for every $\xi \in \theta$, $a_\xi \cap b_\xi = \emptyset$. The pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is **locally split** if for every $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{A}$, and every $\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathcal{B}$, such that $|\mathcal{X} \cup \mathcal{Y}| \leq \aleph_1$, the pair $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ **splits** (i.e. $(\exists c \subseteq \omega)[(\forall a \in \mathcal{X})|a \setminus c| < \aleph_0$ and $(\forall b \in \mathcal{Y})|c \cap b| < \aleph_0]$). Notice that if $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is locally split in V , then $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is locally split in every c.c.c. extension of V .

For a disjoint pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ we define the partial order

$$S(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) = \{f : \theta \rightarrow \omega : |f| < \aleph_0 \text{ and } (\forall \xi, \eta \in \text{dom}(f)) (a_\xi - f(\xi)) \cap (b_\eta - f(\eta)) = \emptyset\}.$$

$S(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is partially ordered by inclusion. It is well known that if $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is locally split, then $S(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is c.c.c., and therefore, if in addition MA_θ holds, then $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ can be split (to split $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ use the set $c = \bigcup \{a_\xi - f(\xi) : f \in G, \xi \in \text{dom}(f)\}$ Where G is a sufficiently generic filter on $S(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$).

If $x \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0}$, then we define

$$a(x) = \bigcap_{\xi \in x} a_\xi.$$

$a(\emptyset) = \omega$, and $b(x)$ is defined analogously.

The pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is **nice** if for every $X = \{x_i : i \in \theta\}$, a family of disjoint finite subsets of θ , there are $i, j \in \theta$ such that $a(x_i) \cap b(x_j) \neq \emptyset$. It is not hard to see that a nice disjoint (θ, θ) pair is also a **gap** (i.e. can not be split). Therefore, the existence of a nice, locally split, disjoint (θ, θ) pair contradicts MA_θ . “Nice” is a variation of Kunen’s “strong gap” [K1].

To add a nice, disjoint (θ, θ) gap that is locally split, one uses the partial order $\mathcal{P}$ defined by:

$$p \in \mathcal{P} \iff p = \langle n_p, s_p, a_p, b_p, Z_p, \langle c_p^z : z \in Z_p \rangle \rangle$$

where $n_p \in \omega$, $s_p \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0}$, a_p & $b_p \subseteq n_p \times s_p$, $a_p \cap b_p = \emptyset$, $Z_p \in [[\theta]^{\leq \aleph_1}]^{<\aleph_0}$, and $(\forall z \in Z_p) c_p^z \subseteq n_p$. The ordering on $\mathcal{P}$ is defined by putting $q \leq p$ if and only if the following five conditions hold:

- (1) $s_q \supseteq s_p \wedge n_q \geq n_p \wedge Z_q \supseteq Z_p$.
- (2) $a_q \cap (n_p \times s_p) = a_p$ and $b_q \cap (n_p \times s_p) = b_p$.
- (3) $(\forall z \in Z_p) c_q^z \cap n_p = c_p^z$.
- (4) $(\forall \xi, \eta \in s_p)(\forall l \in [n_p, n_q)) [\langle l, \xi \rangle \in a_q \rightarrow \langle l, \eta \rangle \notin b_q]$.
- (5) $(\forall z \in Z_p)(\forall \xi \in z \cap s_p)(\forall l \in [n_p, n_q)) [(\langle l, \xi \rangle \in a_q \rightarrow l \in c_q^z) \wedge (\langle l, \xi \rangle \in b_q \rightarrow l \notin c_q^z)]$. ■

$\mathcal{P}$ is c.c.c., and forcing with $\mathcal{P}$ adds the disjoint pair $\mathcal{A} = \{a_\xi : \xi \in \theta\}, \mathcal{B} = \{b_\xi : \xi \in \theta\}$, where $a_\xi = \{l \in \omega : (\exists p \in G) \langle l, \xi \rangle \in a_p\}$ (b_ξ is defined similarly), and G is the generic filter. To see that $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is locally split it is enough to show that for every $z \in [\theta]^{\aleph_1} \cap V$, the pair $(\{a_\xi : \xi \in z\}, \{b_\xi : \xi \in z\})$ splits (this is enough because $\mathcal{P}$ is c.c.c., and therefore every subset of θ with cardinality $\aleph_1$ in the extension is contained in such a subset from V). But this pair get split by $\bigcup \{c_p^z : p \in G \text{ and } z \in Z_p\}$. Finally let us show that

Fact 0. *The pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is nice.*

Proof. Assume that $p \in \mathcal{P}$ is such that

$$p \Vdash "X = \{x_i : i \in \theta\} \text{ are finite disjoint subsets of } \theta".$$

For every $i \in \theta$, let $p_i \leq p$ and $y_i \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0}$ be such that $p_i \Vdash "x_i = y_i"$. Let $\kappa < \lambda < \theta$ be an arbitrary regular cardinal. Let $A \in [\theta]^\lambda$ and $n \in \omega$ be such that:

- (a) $(\forall i \in A) n_{p_i} = n$.
- (b) $\{s_{p_i} : i \in A\}$ form a delta system with root s and $(\forall i, j \in A)[a_{p_i} \cap (n \times s) = a_{p_j} \cap (n \times s) \text{ and } b_{p_i} \cap (n \times s) = b_{p_j} \cap (n \times s)]$.
- (c) $\{Z_{p_i} : i \in A\}$ form a delta system with root Z and $(\forall z \in Z) c_{p_i}^z = c_{p_j}^z$.
- (d) $(\forall i \in A) s_{p_i} \supset y_i$.

Notice that (a)-(c) imply that $\{p_i : i \in A\}$ are linked (i.e. pairwise compatible) and therefore $\{y_i : i \in A\}$ are disjoint. Let $\bar{Z} = \bigcup Z$, then $|\bar{Z}| \leq \aleph_1$. Therefore we can find $i \neq j \in A$ such that

$$y_i \cap s = y_i \cap \bar{Z} = y_j \cap s = y_j \cap \bar{Z} = \emptyset.$$

Finally define $q \leq p_i, p_j$ as follows: let $n_q = n + 1$, let $s_q = s_{p_i} \cup s_{p_j}$, and $Z_q = Z_{p_i} \cup Z_{p_j}$. We put

$$\langle n, \xi \rangle \in a_q \iff \xi \in y_i$$

$$\langle n, \xi \rangle \in b_q \iff \xi \in y_j.$$

We also make sure that for every $z \in (Z_{p_i} \setminus Z)$, if $\xi \in z \cap y_i$, then $n \in c_q^z$, and that for every $z \in (Z_{p_j} \setminus Z)$, if $\xi \in z \cap y_j$, then $n \notin c_q^z$. Notice that this does not cause a contradiction since only $z \notin Z$ are involved. We conclude that $q \leq p$ and that

$$q \Vdash "n \in a(x_i) \cap b(x_j)". \quad \square$$

Given a disjoint (θ, θ) pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ and $X = \{x_i : i \in \theta\}$ a family of disjoint finite subsets of θ , we make the following definition. We call $S = \{S_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ an **X-sequence** if the S_α 's are disjoint subsets of θ and $(\forall \alpha < \kappa) [|S_\alpha| > \theta_\alpha \text{ and } (\forall i, j \in S_\alpha) a(x_i) \cap b(x_j) = \emptyset]$.

Next, for every $X = \{x_i : i \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ , and every $S = \{S_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ an X -sequence, we define:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}(X, S) = \{F \in [\kappa]^{<\aleph_0} : & (\forall \alpha \neq \beta \in F) (\exists i \in S_\alpha) (\exists j \in S_\beta) \\ & [a(x_i) \cap b(x_j) \neq \emptyset \vee b(x_i) \cap a(x_j) \neq \emptyset]\} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\mathcal{P}(X, S) = \{F \in [\kappa]^{<\aleph_0} : (\forall \alpha \neq \beta \in F)(\forall i \in S_\alpha)(\forall j \in S_\beta) \\ [a(x_i) \cap b(x_j) = \emptyset \wedge b(x_i) \cap a(x_j) = \emptyset]\}.$$

$\mathcal{Q}(X, S)$ and $\mathcal{P}(X, S)$ are both partially ordered by inclusion. Notice that the last three definitions depend on $\mathcal{A} = \{a_\xi : \xi \in \theta\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{b_\xi : \xi \in \theta\}$. $\mathcal{P}(X, S)$ is a typical “dangerous” partial order (see definition 1), and $\mathcal{Q}(X, S)$ will be used in the proof of Kunen’s result to “kill” dangerous partial orders. Notice that $\mathcal{P}(X, S) \times \mathcal{Q}(X, S)$ is not κ .c.c. (the set $\{\langle \{\alpha\}, \{\alpha\} \rangle : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is an antichain of size κ).

§1 A proof of Kunen’s result.

The first step is to show that the niceness of the pair is in fact a statement concerning the κ .c.c. of the various $\mathcal{Q}(X, S)$ ’s.

Lemma 1. *Assume that $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is a (θ, θ) pair. Then $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is nice if and only if for every $X = \{x_u : u \in \theta\}$, $Y = \{y_v : v \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ and every $S = \{S_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ an X -sequence, and $T = \{T_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ a Y -sequence, the partial order $\mathcal{Q}(X, S) \times \mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ is κ .c.c.*

Proof. The reverse implication is easy to check. Let us prove the direct implication. Assume that $\{\langle K_\gamma, F_\gamma \rangle : \gamma < \kappa\}$ is an antichain in $\mathcal{Q}(X, S) \times \mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$. We may assume that $\{K_\gamma : \gamma < \kappa\}$ are disjoint and all have size n , and that the F_γ ’s are disjoint and all have size p (use delta systems).

For $t \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0}$, we call t a γ -**transversal** if $|t| = n+p$, and $(\forall \alpha \in K_\gamma) |t \cap S_\alpha| = 1$, and $(\forall \beta \in F_\gamma) |t \cap T_\beta| = 1$. Choose $\{t_i : i \in \theta\}$ pairwise disjoint, with each t_i being a γ -transversal for some $\gamma < \kappa$. Next, let $Z = \{z_i : i \in \theta\}$ be defined in the following way. If t_i is a γ -transversal, then

$$z_i = (\cup \{x_u : u \in (t_i \cap S_\alpha) \wedge \alpha \in K_\gamma\}) \cup (\cup \{y_v : v \in (t_i \cap T_\beta) \wedge \beta \in F_\gamma\}).$$

Since both $\{x_u : u \in \theta\}$ and $\{y_v : v \in \theta\}$ are pairwise disjoint, and the transversals $\{t_i : i \in \theta\}$ are pairwise disjoint, we may assume that $Z = \{z_i : i \in \theta\}$ are pairwise disjoint.

Finally, we show that the existence of Z contradicts the niceness of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$. Let $i \neq j \in \theta$.

Case 1: t_i, t_j are both γ -transversals. Let $\alpha \in K_\gamma$ (if $n = 0$, then work with the F_γ 's). Let $u \in (t_i \cap S_\alpha)$ and $w \in (t_j \cap S_\alpha)$ with $u \neq w$. Clearly, $a(x_u) \cap b(x_w) = b(x_u) \cap a(x_w) = \emptyset$ (because S is an X -sequence). But $x_u \subset z_i$ and $x_w \subset z_j$ therefore $a(z_i) \cap b(z_j) = b(z_i) \cap a(z_j) = \emptyset$.

Case 2: t_i is a γ -transversal, and t_j is a δ -transversal, and $\gamma \neq \delta$. In this case $\langle K_\gamma, F_\gamma \rangle \perp \langle K_\delta, F_\delta \rangle$. Assume w.l.o.g. that $K_\gamma \perp K_\delta$. This means that

$$(\exists \alpha \in K_\gamma)(\exists \beta \in K_\delta)(\forall u \in S_\alpha)(\forall w \in S_\beta) a(x_u) \cap b(x_w) = b(x_u) \cap a(x_w) = \emptyset.$$

Now let $u \in (t_i \cap S_\alpha)$ and $w \in (t_j \cap S_\beta)$. By the above, $a(x_u) \cap b(x_w) = b(x_u) \cap a(x_w) = \emptyset$. But $x_u \subset z_i$ and $x_w \subset z_j$, therefore $a(z_i) \cap b(z_j) = b(z_i) \cap a(z_j) = \emptyset$. $\square$

Similarly, it can be shown that $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is nice if and only if every $\mathcal{Q}(X, S)$ is κ .c.c., and also if and only if the product of any finitely many partial orders of the form $\mathcal{Q}(X, S)$ is κ .c.c.

It is also true that if $\tilde{S} = \{S_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ is defined by $S_\alpha = [\theta_\alpha, \theta_\alpha^+)$, then: $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is nice if and only if for every $X = \{x_u : u \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ , if $\tilde{S}$ is an X -sequence, then $\mathcal{Q}(X, \tilde{S})$ is κ .c.c.

Definition 1. Assume that $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is a nice pair. The partial order $\mathcal{R}$ is called **dangerous** for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ if there exists $r \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$r \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} “(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \text{ is not nice}”.$$

The following style of proof was motivated by [S].

Lemma 2. Assume that $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is a nice (θ, θ) pair, and $\mathcal{R}$ is a κ .c.c. partial order with $|\mathcal{R}| < \theta$. Then $\mathcal{R}$ is dangerous for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ if and only if there exist $Y = \{y_i : i \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ , and $T = \{T_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ a Y -sequence, such that $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ is not κ .c.c.

Proof. ($\Leftarrow$): If $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ is not κ .c.c., then there exists $r \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$r \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} “\mathcal{Q}(Y, T) \text{ is not } \kappa\text{-c.c.}”.$$

Therefore, by Lemma 1, $\mathcal{R}$ is dangerous.

($\Rightarrow$): Let $r \in \mathcal{R}$ be such that

$r \Vdash$ “ $X = \{x_i : i \in \theta\}$ are disjoint finite subsets of θ and $(\forall i, j \in \theta) a(x_i) \cap b(x_j) = \emptyset$ ”.

($\forall i \in \theta$) let $r_i \leq r$ and $y_i \in [\theta]^{<\aleph_0}$ be such that $r_i \Vdash$ “ $x_i = y_i$ ”.

$|\mathcal{R}| < \theta$, therefore $(\exists \beta_0 < \kappa)(\forall \beta \geq \beta_0)(\exists p_\beta \leq r)$ such that $|\{i \in [\theta_\beta, \theta_\beta^+) : p_\beta = r_i\}| = \theta_\beta^+$.

Now, for every $\alpha < \kappa$, let $r_\alpha = p_{\beta_0 + \alpha}$ and

$$T_\alpha = \{i \in [\theta_{\beta_0 + \alpha}, \theta_{\beta_0 + \alpha}^+) : r_\alpha = r_i\}.$$

Notice that for every $\alpha < \kappa$, $\{y_i : i \in T_\alpha\}$ are disjoint. Furthermore we may assume that $\{y_i : i \in \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} T_\alpha\}$ are disjoint (otherwise, by induction on $\alpha < \kappa$, pass to a subset of T_α of cardinality θ_α^+). If $i \notin \bigcup_{\alpha < \kappa} T_\alpha$, then redefine $y_i = \emptyset$. We now have $Y = \{y_i : i \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ , and $\{T_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ a Y -sequence.

Let B be an $\mathcal{R}$ -name for the set $\{\alpha < \kappa : r_\alpha \in G\}$, where G is a name for the generic filter. $\mathcal{R}$ is κ .c.c., therefore there exists $p \leq r$ such that $p \Vdash$ “ $|B| = \kappa$ ”. Finally it is not hard to check that

$$p \Vdash$$
 “ $\{\{\alpha\} : \alpha \in B\}$ is an antichain in $\mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ ”. $\square$

Corollary. *If $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is a nice (θ, θ) pair, then for every $X = \{x_i : i \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ , and every $S = \{S_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ an X -sequence, $\mathcal{Q}(X, S)$ is not dangerous for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.*

Lemma 3. *(See Lemma 8 [K1].) Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ be a nice (θ, θ) pair. Let γ be a limit ordinal and $\mathcal{P}_\gamma$ a finite support iteration of c.c.c. partial orders. If $\mathcal{P}_\gamma$ is dangerous for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, then there exists $\alpha < \gamma$ such that $\mathcal{P}_\alpha$ is dangerous for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.*

Proof. Assume that $\mathcal{P}_\gamma$ is dangerous for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$. There are two cases.

$\text{cof}(\gamma) \neq \kappa$: Let $X = \{x_i : i \in \theta\} \in V[G_\gamma]$, disjoint finite subsets of θ , be a witness for the failure of niceness, where G_γ is a $\mathcal{P}_\gamma$ -generic filter. Now, there are three subcases: $\text{cof}(\gamma) > \theta$, $\kappa < \text{cof}(\gamma) < \theta$, and $\text{cof}(\gamma) < \kappa$. It is not hard to see

that in each of these subcases there exists $\alpha < \gamma$ and there is $A \in [\theta]^\theta$ such that $\{x_i : i \in A\} \in V[G_\alpha]$, contradicting niceness in $V[G_\alpha]$.

$\text{cof}(\gamma) = \kappa$: Let X be as in the previous case. Let $c = \cup\{a(x_i) : i \in \theta\} \subset \omega$. Let $\alpha < \gamma$ be such that $c \in V[G_\alpha]$. (Such an α exists since $\kappa > \omega$.) In $V[G_\alpha]$, let Y be a disjoint family of finite subsets of θ which is maximal with respect to the property

$$(\forall y \in Y) [a(y) \subset c \wedge b(y) \cap c = \emptyset].$$

Y remains maximal in $V[G_\gamma]$ and therefore must have cardinality θ , which contradicts niceness in $V[G_\alpha]$. $\square$

Theorem (Kunen). *It is consistent to have m singular with $\text{cof}(m) = \omega_1$.*

Proof. Let θ be singular with $\text{cof}(\theta) = \kappa = \omega_1$ and force with $\mathcal{P}$ (see §0) to start with $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, a nice, disjoint, locally split (θ, θ) pair. Let us now iterate c.c.c. partial orders of size $< \theta$ in the following way. Assume that the part of the iteration that has been defined thus far is non-dangerous. Assume that the next partial order on the list (of all c.c.c. partial orders of size $< \theta$) is $\mathcal{R}$, but $\mathcal{R}$ is dangerous (otherwise just force with $\mathcal{R}$). Then by Lemma 2, there are $\mathcal{Y}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ such that $\mathcal{R} \times \mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ is not c.c.c. In addition, by Lemma 1, $\mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ is c.c.c. and by the corollary, $\mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ is non-dangerous for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$. So instead of forcing with $\mathcal{R}$, let us force with $\mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ to add an uncountable antichain to $\mathcal{R}$. By Lemma 3, the iteration of non-dangerous c.c.c. partial orders is a non-dangerous c.c.c. partial order. Therefore, in the extension, $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ remains nice and $m = \theta$. $\square$

In the general case (κ is any regular uncountable cardinal), all we know is that $\mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ is κ .c.c. and not necessarily c.c.c. So if $\kappa > \omega_1$, and we perform the iteration as in the proof of the theorem, then cardinals below κ may be collapsed, and we may end up with a model for Kunen's result, in which $\kappa = \omega_1$.

§2 Beyond niceness.

Let us define a condition which implies niceness, and which is, in the presence of MA_κ , equivalent to niceness.

Definition 2. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ be a nice (θ, θ) pair. We say that $(*)$ holds for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ if

there is no c.c.c. partial order of cardinality $< \theta$ which is dangerous for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

The following Lemma shows that $(*)$ is in fact a statement concerning the existence of certain dangerous c.c.c. suborders of the various $\mathcal{P}(Y, T)$'s.

Lemma 4. *Assume that $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is a nice (θ, θ) pair. Then $(*)$ fails for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ if and only if there are $Y = \{y_i : i \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ , and $T = \{T_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ a Y -sequence, and there is $\mathcal{P}' \in [\mathcal{P}(Y, T)]^\kappa$ such that $\mathcal{P}'$, equipt with the ordering of $\mathcal{P}(Y, T)$, is c.c.c. and closed under subsets.*

Proof. $(\Leftarrow)$: $\mathcal{P}' \times \mathcal{Q}(Y, T)$ is not κ .c.c. and hence, by Lemma 1, $\mathcal{P}'$ is dangerous for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

$(\Rightarrow)$: Let $\mathcal{R}$ be a c.c.c. dangerous partial order of cardinality $< \theta$. By the proof of Lemma 2, there are $Y = \{y_i : i \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ , and $T = \{T_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ a Y -sequence, and there are B an $\mathcal{R}$ -name for a subset of κ , and $p \in \mathcal{R}$ such that

$$p \Vdash \text{"}|B| = \kappa \text{ and } \{\{\alpha\} : \alpha \in B\} \text{ is an antichain in } \mathcal{Q}(Y, T)\text{"}.$$

Let $\mathcal{B}(R)$ be the boolean completion of $\mathcal{R}$. For every $F \in [\kappa]^{<\aleph_0}$ let $r(F) = \llbracket F \subset B \rrbracket \cdot p$, where $\llbracket F \subset B \rrbracket$ is the boolean value of " $F \subset B$ " in $\mathcal{B}(R)$. Now define

$$\mathcal{P}' = \{F \in [\kappa]^{<\aleph_0} : r(F) > 0\}.$$

$\mathcal{P}' \subset \mathcal{P}(Y, T)$, and $|\mathcal{P}'| = \kappa$ (because $p \Vdash \text{"}|B| = \kappa\text{"}$.)

Finally, assume that $F \perp_{\mathcal{P}'} K$. Then $r(F \cup K) = 0$, and therefore $r(F) \cdot r(K) = 0$. This proves that $\mathcal{P}'$ is c.c.c. since $\mathcal{B}(R)$ is c.c.c. $\square$

Similar to the proof of Fact 0, and using Lemma 4, one can now show that the nice disjoint locally split pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, that was added using $\mathcal{P}$ in §0, also satisfies the property $(*)$. Let us check how well property $(*)$ is preserved through a c.c.c. iteration of partial orders of size $< \theta$.

We first show that $(*)$ is preserved through successor steps of the iteration. More precisely, if $(*)$ holds for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ and $\mathcal{R}$ is a c.c.c. partial order with $|\mathcal{R}| < \theta$, then $\Vdash_{\mathcal{R}} \text{"}(*\text{) holds for } (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\text{"}$. To show this assume otherwise. By Lemma 4, there is

$r \in \mathcal{R}$ and π an $\mathcal{R}$ -name such that

$r \Vdash_{\mathcal{R}}$ “there are $Y = \{y_i : i \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ , and T , a Y -sequence with $\pi \in [\mathcal{P}(Y, T)]^\kappa$, and π is c.c.c. and closed under subsets”.

In particular $\mathcal{R} * \pi$ is a dangerous c.c.c. partial order. But $\mathcal{R} * \pi$ has a dense subset of cardinality $< \theta$, namely $\{(r, F) : r \in \mathcal{R}, F \in [\kappa]^{<\aleph_0} \text{ and } r \Vdash'' F \in \pi''\}$. Therefore $(*)$ fails for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, which is a contradiction.

As for the preservation of $(*)$ at limits, we can only show the cases where $\text{cof}(\gamma) \neq \kappa$ (see Lemma 3). We first remark that in these cases the following holds: if $B \in [\kappa]^\kappa$, $Y = \{y_i : i \in \theta\}$ disjoint finite subsets of θ , and $T = \{T_\alpha : \alpha < \kappa\}$ a Y -sequence, are all in $V[G_\gamma]$, then there exists $\beta < \gamma$ such that in $V[G_\beta]$, there exists $A \in [B]^\kappa$, and for every $\alpha \in A$, $T'_\alpha \in [T_\alpha]^{\theta^+}$ are such that $\{y_i : i \in \bigcup_{\alpha \in A} T'_\alpha\} \in V[G_\beta]$.

The proof that this remark implies that $(*)$ is preserved proceeds as follows. Assume that $(*)$ fails in $V[G_\gamma]$. By Lemma 4, let Y, T be given and $\mathcal{P}' \in [\mathcal{P}(Y, T)]^\kappa$ such that $\mathcal{P}'$ is c.c.c. and closed under subsets. Let $B = \{\alpha \in \kappa : \{\alpha\} \in \mathcal{P}'\}$. Now let $\beta < \gamma$ and $A \in [B]^\kappa$ as discussed above. In $V[G_\beta]$ define the partial order

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{P}'' &= \{F \in [A]^{<\aleph_0} : (\forall \alpha \neq \beta \in F)(\forall i \in T'_\alpha)(\forall j \in T'_\beta) \\ &\quad [a(y_i) \cap b(y_j) = \emptyset \wedge b(y_i) \cap a(y_j) = \emptyset]\}. \end{aligned}$$

In $V[G_\gamma]$, consider $\mathcal{R}' = \{F \in [A]^{<\aleph_0} : F \in \mathcal{P}'\}$. $\mathcal{R}' \subset \mathcal{P}''$ and $\mathcal{R}'$ is a c.c.c. partial order of cardinality κ . Finally, $V[G_\gamma]$ is a forcing extension of $V[G_\beta]$, therefore in $V[G_\beta]$ we can define the partial order $\mathcal{R}'' = \{F \in \mathcal{P}'' : \llbracket F \in \mathcal{P}' \rrbracket \cdot \llbracket \mathcal{P}' \text{ is c.c.c.} \rrbracket > 0\}$. $|\mathcal{R}''| = \kappa$ because $\mathcal{R}' \subset \mathcal{R}''$. $\mathcal{R}''$ is c.c.c. because $V[G_\gamma]$ is a c.c.c. extension of $V[G_\beta]$. Therefore, $V[G_\beta] \models \text{“}\mathcal{R}'' \text{ is c.c.c. and dangerous for } (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})\text{”}$, and hence $(*)$ fails in $V[G_\beta]$.

Finally, let us look again at the case where $\text{cof}(\theta) = \kappa = \omega_1$. Let $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ be a nice (θ, θ) pair. We claim that there exists a c.c.c. partial order $\mathcal{Q}$ such that

$$\Vdash_{\mathcal{Q}} \text{“} (*) \text{ holds for } (\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}) \text{”}.$$

$\mathcal{Q}$ is simply the finite support iteration of all partial orders of the form $(\mathcal{Q}(X, S))^\omega$ (product with finite support). $\mathcal{Q}$ is c.c.c. and, by the Corollary and Lemma 3, it

preserves the niceness of $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$. In the extension, all partial orders of the form $\mathcal{Q}(X, S)$ are σ -centered and therefore, by Lemma 2, $(*)$ holds for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

This discussion suggests an alternative way of viewing Kunen's result. Start with a disjoint, locally split (θ, θ) pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ for which $(*)$ holds (add such a pair using $\mathcal{P}$ which was defined in §0). Then iterate all c.c.c. partial orders of cardinality $< \theta$. By the remarks above, $(*)$ may first fail only at limits of cofinality ω_1 . In this case, by Lemma 3, $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is still nice so first force with $\mathcal{Q}$, as defined above, to get an extension in which $(*)$ holds for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, and then force with the next c.c.c. partial order of cardinality $< \theta$ on the list.

Concluding remarks. Given a disjoint (θ, θ) pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ we discussed two properties:

(1) $(*)$ holds for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$.

(2) $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is nice.

(1) implies (2). (1) is preserved while forcing with c.c.c. partial orders of cardinality less than θ (we do not have a similar result for (2)). Both (1) and (2) are preserved at limit stages of c.c.c. iterations, of cofinality $\neq \kappa$. (2) is also preserved at limit stages of cofinality $= \kappa$ (we do not have a similar result for (1)).

Roughly speaking, it seems desirable to have uncountable c.c.c. suborders of the various $\mathcal{Q}(X, S)$'s. This would enable us to kill the dangerous partial orders as they come along, or alternatively, force $(*)$ to hold and consequently kill all the dangerous partial orders at once.

It should be mentioned that if one starts with a nice (θ, θ) pair $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, and then tries to preserve the niceness along a c.c.c. iteration of all partial orders of size less than θ , then the only difficulty lies in getting MA_κ to hold. This is true because if MA_κ holds, then $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ is nice if and only if $(*)$ holds for $(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$, and therefore one is free to force with the next partial order on the list.

On the otherhand if $\lambda < \kappa$, then MA_λ could be forced without destroying niceness because c.c.c. partial orders of size λ are not dangerous. So if $\kappa > \omega_1$, then one can force $\text{MA}_{\aleph_1}$ and preserve niceness. In this stage all c.c.c. partial orders are c.c.c.-productive and if there are still dangerous ones, they can not be killed and the iteration is stuck.

REFERENCES

- [K] **K**. Kunen, *Set Theory*, North-Holland, 1980.
- [K1]**K** Kunen, *Where MA First Fails*, J. Symbolic Logic **53** (1988).
- [S] S. Shelah, *personal conversation*.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, THE UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS, LAWRENCE, KS 66045

E-mail address: `landver@kuhub.cc.ukans.edu`